



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Historical Context on Indiana's School Turnaround Efforts

December 2, 2015

Topics

- ▶ **State and Federal Context**
- ▶ **Activities Preceding SBOE Interventions**
- ▶ **Indiana's Turnaround Academies**

Performance Categories (P.L. 221)

IC 20-31-8-3 and IC 20-31-8-4 (dates back to P.L. 221, 1999)

- ▶ The State Board of Education (SBOE) “shall establish a number of categories... to designate performance based on the individual student academic performance and growth to proficiency in each school.”
- ▶ Further, the SBOE “shall place each school in a category or designation of school performance based on the department's findings from the assessment of performance and academic growth” as further described in statute.
- ▶ SBOE adopted rules in 2001, which included names for performance categories e.g., Academic Progress, Academic Probation, as well as a method of calculating performance.

Performance Category Updates (2011-2013)

- ▶ The SBOE adopted rule language in 2011 changing the performance category names to an A to F letter grade scale, although the methodology for placing schools in categories remained the same
- ▶ The current A-F rules determining how grades are determined were adopted in 2012 and implemented for the first time for school grades assigned for the 2011-2012 academic year
- ▶ In 2013, state law was modified to require that the performance categories be labeled using an A through F scale

State Board Interventions

- ▶ If a school is in the lowest performance category (an “F”) for six years consecutively, then the SBOE shall determine an intervention for the school.
 - ▶ *Per a legislative change in 2015, schools are eligible for SBOE intervention support after four consecutive years of performance in the lowest category (“F”). This legislative change will start with schools placed in the lowest performance category for the 2015-16 school year and beyond.*
- ▶ IC 20-31-9-4 lists the following interventions: (1) Merging the school with a nearby school that is in a higher performance category; (2) Assigning a special management team to operate all or part of the school; (3) The IDOE’s recommendation for improving the school; (4) Other options for school improvement, including closing the school; (5) Revising the school’s plan in any of the following areas: (a) changes in school procedures or operations; (b) professional development; (c) intervention for individual teachers or administrators.
- ▶ Public hearing in the school corporation where the school is located.
- ▶ The SBOE must implement an intervention if it determines that

Statutory Definition of “Turnaround Academy”

- ▶ Any school in which the Board has intervened is considered a “turnaround academy” under IC 20-31-9-4.
- ▶ This includes schools operated by a special management company, referred to in Indiana as a “Turnaround School Operator” or “TSO”, or a school in which a Partner is conducting a more limited scope of work.



Federal Requirements: NCLB Waiver

- ▶ Indiana's received full approval in February 2012 for its waiver request from certain aspects of No Child Left Behind (NCLB - 2001).
- ▶ Indiana was among cohort of 10 states to receive a waiver.
- ▶ Among other flexibilities granted, Indiana received approval to use one accountability system - the state's A-F system - instead of both the federal AYP system and the state's accountability system (P.L. 221)
- ▶ Defined Priority Schools as schools receiving an F or a D/F for two or more consecutive years
- ▶ Defined Focus Schools as schools receiving a D (first-year)
- ▶ The NCLB waiver for Indiana was renewed by USDE for 3 years in July 2015

NCLB Waiver Commitment for Turnaround Academies

- ▶ “For a Turnaround Academy to rejoin the LEA, the SBOE will need to see that the LEA has, in the time that the Turnaround Academy has been operated by a TSO, demonstrated significant improvement in its other priority and focus schools as well as made appropriate district-level changes in staffing and structure to better support its low-performing schools. When determining the next steps for a Turnaround Academy at the end of the TSO’s four-year operational contract, the SBOE will have a menu of options from which to select, including renewing the TSO’s contract.”

Exit Options Added in 2014

IC 20-31-9-9 allows for the following:

- ▶ Not later than December 31 of the fifth year of an intervention under this chapter, the state board shall take one (1) of the following actions:
- ▶ (1) Return the school to the school corporation for operation.
- ▶ (2) Direct the special management team to apply to a charter school authorizer for charter school status for the school.
- ▶ (3) Implement a new intervention under section 4(b) of this chapter.

Topics

- ▶ State and Federal Context

- ▶ Activities Preceding SBOE Interventions

- ▶ Indiana's Turnaround Academies

State Activities Under P.L. 221: School Quality Reviews

- ▶ P.L. 221 requires review of schools following 4 consecutive years in the lowest performance category
- ▶ This occurred for the first time in 2009-2010 for 23 schools
- ▶ Cambridge Education contracted with the state to assist with Year-4 School Quality Reviews
 1. To advise the **SBOE** and **IDOE** concerning turnaround operations
 2. To create **Quality Review Visitation Teams**
 3. To prepare **Quality Review Findings** reported to the **School Principal** and **District Personnel** following the review
- ▶ Prior to school visits, community meetings held to gather input, which was shared with districts and school principals

School Monitoring Activities in Year 5: 2010-2011

- ▶ 23 schools statewide were on track for possible intervention by the SBOE in Year 6 under P.L. 221
- ▶ IDOE Title Office staff:
 - ▶ Monitored implementation of Cambridge recommendations
 - ▶ Visited each of the 23 schools a minimum of 4 times
- ▶ Federal SIG (a) Grants were awarded to assist schools
- ▶ 16 of the 23 schools made enough improvements to avoid placement in lowest performance category
- ▶ 7 of the 23 schools remained in the lowest performance category, triggering SBOE intervention under P.L. 221
 - ▶ 1 Gary Community School Corporation school
 - ▶ 6 IPS schools

Spring of Year 5 Activities: Spring 2011

- ▶ **SBOE held required public hearings** at each of the 7 schools
- ▶ **During hearings:**
 - ▶ School performance data provided
 - ▶ State law requirements explained
 - ▶ District presented proposal for each school
 - ▶ Community members provided testimony
- ▶ **RFP for third-party operators issued, eligible vendors identified**

Topics

- ▶ State and Federal Context
- ▶ Activities Preceding SBOE Interventions
- ▶ Indiana's Turnaround Academies

SBOE Intervention Support: Fall 2011

- ▶ Schools placed in performance categories by SBOE
- ▶ SBOE determined which interventions to implement at 7 schools under P.L. 221 requirements
- ▶ Five Schools assigned **Turnaround School Operators (TSOs)**
 - ▶ Edison Learning: Theodore Roosevelt Community High School (Gary)
 - ▶ Tindley/EdPower: Arlington High School (IPS)
 - ▶ Charter Schools USA: Emma Donnan, Emmerich Manual High School, Thomas Carr Howe Community High School (IPS)
 - ▶ There was one “observation” year in 2011-2012. The first year each TSO managed the school was the 2012-2013 school year.
- ▶ Two IPS Schools assigned **Lead Partners (LPs)**
 - ▶ Broad Ripple Magnet High School (two Lead Partners: Scholastic, The New Teacher Project (“TNTP”))
 - ▶ George Washington Community High School (two Lead Partners: Wireless Generation, TNTP)

SBOE Intervention Support: Fall 2012 and Winter 2013

- ▶ In **Fall 2012**, one additional IPS school became eligible for SBOE intervention under P.L. 221
- ▶ The SBOE assigned a **Lead Partner** as the appropriate intervention
 - ▶ John Marshall Community High School (two Lead Partners: Voyager, TNTP)
- ▶ In **Winter 2013**, a school from Evansville Vanderburgh School Corporation became eligible for SBOE intervention under P.L. 221
- ▶ The SBOE assigned a **Lead Partner** as the appropriate intervention
 - ▶ Glenwood Leadership Academy (“internal” Lead Partner: EVSC, which in turn contracts with Mass Insight)

SBOE Intervention Support: Summer and Fall 2014

- ▶ Public hearings held July and August 2014
- ▶ Lincoln Middle School, EVSC received SBOE intervention support funds their “internal” Lead Partner model.

SBOE Intervention Support: Spring 2015

- ▶ School Quality Reviews (year 4 schools) were conducted at:
 - ▶ Block Middle School, East Chicago
 - ▶ Joyce Kilmer #69, IPS
 - ▶ George H Fisher #93, IPS
 - ▶ Beveridge Elementary School, GCSC
 - ▶ Lodge Community School, EVSC

- ▶ Each school was debriefed and provided the formal SQR report with recommended next steps to support their school turnaround efforts.

SBOE Intervention Support: Summer 2015

- ▶ Public hearings were held at the three Year 5 schools:
 - ▶ West Side Leadership Academy, GCSC
 - ▶ Caze Elementary School, EVSC
 - ▶ Washington Middle School, EVSC
- ▶ Public testimony was documented and provided to all SBOE members for consideration should the schools qualify for formal SBOE intervention support in spring 2016.

SBOE Intervention Support: Fall 2015

- ▶ SBOE took action in September 2015 to release turnaround support funds to three schools who have, for 5 consecutive years, have been placed in the lowest performing categories. The schools are:
 - ▶ Caze Elementary (EVSC)
 - ▶ Washington Middle School (EVSC)
 - ▶ West Side Leadership Academy (GCSC)
- ▶ Each school received \$150,000 of turnaround support funds from the SBOE to help with their school turnaround effort for the 2015-16 school year.

Summary of Current SBOE Intervention Supports 2015-16

▶ Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation

- ▶ Lincoln Middle School - Internal Lead Partner (\$300,000)
- ▶ Glenwood Leadership Academy - Internal Lead Partner (\$300,000)
- ▶ *Caze Elementary School* - Internal Lead Partner (\$150,000)*
- ▶ *Washington Middle School* - Internal Lead Partner (\$150,000)*

▶ Gary Community School Corporation

- ▶ Roosevelt - Edison Learning, TSO (\$900,000)
- ▶ *West Side Leadership Academy* - Internal Lead Partner (\$150,000)*

▶ Indianapolis Public Schools

- ▶ John Marshall HS/MS - Marzano, Partner (\$300,000)
- ▶ Broad Ripple MS - Marzano, Partner (\$150,000)
- ▶ Transformation Zone: Arlington HS/MS Phase - Mass Insight Support (\$500,000)
- ▶ Transformation Zone: Washington HS/MS Phase - Mass Insight Support (\$400,000)
 - ▶ *Additional 5 Schools for IPS Transformation Zone* - Mass Insight Support (\$650,000)*
- ▶ Emma Donnan MS - Charter School USA (CSUSA), TSO - (\$1,191,115)
- ▶ T.C. Howe HS/MS - Charter School USA (CSUSA), TSO - (\$900,000)
- ▶ Emmerich Manual HS - Charter Schools USA (CSUSA), TSO (\$900,000)